The Founders' Premonition: Foreign Influence, Messianic Geopolitics, and the Collapse of Sovereignty in the 2026 Iran War

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

April 24, 2026

The United States was born from a deep-seated suspicion of "foreign intrigue," a fear that external powers would eventually corrupt the internal mechanics of the Republic. George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and John Adams collectively warned that once the American executive began to prioritize the strategic or theological objectives of an ally over domestic interests, the nation's independence would be effectively lost. This paper argues that the events leading up to the 2026 Iran War—specifically Operation Epic Fury—represent the ultimate realization of these fears. Through a synthesis of eighteenth-century political theory and the modern "Second Pearl Harbor" phenomenon, we analyze how a rhetorical shift toward "messianic geopolitics" facilitated the total strategic convergence of U.S. and Israeli military objectives. By sidelining empirical intelligence and redefining the doctrine of "imminence," the administration transitioned the American military from a regional balancer into a primary enforcer for a foreign state's territorial ambitions. The resulting global energy crisis and humanitarian fallout serve as a grim monument to the dangers of "entangling alliances" in an era of asymmetric warfare and ideological crusades.

Keywords: American Founders, Foreign Influence, Operation Epic Fury, 2026 Iran War, Sovereignty, Messianic Geopolitics, Mark Levin, George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Second Pearl Harbor, Greater Israel Project, War of Aggression.

A collaboration with Google Gemini-3.1-Thinking. CC4.0.

Outline

1. The Foundational Doctrine: Washington, Hamilton, and the Fear of Foreign Factions

2. The "Baneful Foe": George Washington’s Farewell Address vs. 2026 Policy Fidelity

3. Foreign Intrigue and the Executive: Alexander Hamilton’s Barrier Against "Cabal"

4. The Rhetorical Pivot: Mark Levin and the "First Jewish President" Paradigm

5. Theological Convergence: Christian Apologetics vs. Jewish Messianism in Policy

6. Operation Epic Fury: The Shift from Regional Balancer to Strategic Enforcer

7. The Sidelining of Intelligence: Manufacturing Threat in the 2026 Landscape

8. The Greater Israel Project: Strategic Alignment and Territorial Ambition

9. Legal Consequences: Nuremberg Principles and the Definition of Aggressive War

10. Global Fallout: The Dual-Blockade of the Strait of Hormuz and Economic Paralysis

11. The Erosion of "America First": From Domestic Renewal to Regional Restructuring

12. Conclusion: Reclaiming Sovereignty in a Post-Epic Fury World

References

Art

1. The Foundational Doctrine: Washington, Hamilton, and the Fear of Foreign Factions

The American experiment was conceived with an acute awareness of the fragility of republican self-governance, a system the architects of the Constitution believed was uniquely vulnerable to external corruption. To the Founders, the most insidious threat to a free society was not found in the strength of an external enemy on the battlefield, but in the subtle, corrosive power of foreign influence within the halls of domestic power. They viewed foreign intrigue as a "mortal disease" that could transform a sovereign nation into a satellite of another power without a single shot being fired. This foundational anxiety was not born of isolationism but of a realistic assessment of human nature and the historical collapse of previous republics. The modern assessment of the 2026 Iran War as a "second Pearl Harbor" is grounded in this very tradition, viewing the strategic realignment of the United States as a definitive breach of the principles intended to safeguard American independence.

The Republican Sensitivity to Foreign Intrigue

For the revolutionary generation, the term "foreign influence" carried a specific and terrifying weight, representing the antithesis of the "consent of the governed". If a foreign power could sway the decisions of the American executive or the legislature, the people were no longer the authors of their own laws. The Founders believed that republics were uniquely vulnerable to this type of subversion because their open political systems offered multiple points of entry for foreign actors—through the press, the bribery of officials, or the manipulation of public opinion. This led to a doctrine of strategic detachment, intended to prevent the young nation from becoming a pawn in the "exterminating havoc" of global rivalries. The 2026 conflict, characterized by some as an internal surrender of the "America First" doctrine, is seen as the ultimate manifestation of the vulnerability the Founders sought to prevent through strict constitutional and diplomatic boundaries.

George Washington and the Great Rule of Conduct

George Washington used his 1796 Farewell Address to deliver a final, urgent warning to the American people regarding their relationship with the rest of the world. He argued that a "passionate attachment" of one nation for another produces a variety of evils, including the illusion of a common interest where no real common interest exists. Washington warned that such attachments lead the smaller nation to adopt the enmities of the larger one and participate in its quarrels and wars without justification. He famously called foreign influence one of the "most baneful foes of republican government," emphasizing that it works by misleading public opinion and influencing or awing the public councils. In the context of 2020s geopolitics, the transition from a balanced regional arbiter to a primary enforcer for a foreign

state’s ambitions is interpreted by critics as the exact "artificial" attachment Washington feared would compromise U.S. sovereignty.

Alexander Hamilton and the Barrier Against Corruption

While Washington focused on the spirit of the people, Alexander Hamilton focused on the structure of the government to resist foreign encroachment. In the Federalist Papers, Hamilton argued that the presidency was the most likely target for foreign intrigue. He believed that foreign powers would have a strong interest in gaining an "improper ascendant in our councils" by placing a "creature of their own" in the executive office. To prevent this, the Founders designed mechanisms like the Electoral College to ensure the presidency remained independent of "cabal, intrigue, and corruption" from abroad. Hamilton noted that in a republic, the temptation for foreign bribery is immense because the power is shared. The 2026 paradigm, where executive decision-making was allegedly captured by a small cadre of advisors prioritizing a foreign ally’s security requirements over empirical domestic assessments, represents a collapse of the institutional barriers Hamilton envisioned to protect the executive branch.

John Adams and the Threat to Self-Governance

John Adams was equally concerned with the purity of the American political process and the integrity of its leadership. In his 1797 Inaugural Address, he warned that if an election could be influenced by foreign nations—whether through "flattery or menaces, by fraud or violence"—the government would no longer be the choice of the American people. Adams feared that foreign influence would essentially replace the American voter with a foreign interest, turning the republic into a tool of external masters. He understood that the moment the U.S. government began to prioritize the territorial or strategic needs of a foreign ally above the security and prosperity of the American homeland, it had ceased to be a sovereign government. This theme is echoed in the 2026 analysis of Operation Epic Fury, where the subordination of American law to the tactical needs of an ally is framed as a historic surrender of sovereignty.

The Collapse of Foundational Restraint

The Founders’ collective vision was a nation that acted with "honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none." They sought to maintain a strategic distance that allowed the United States to decide on its own peace or war, based on its own interests and sense of justice. The 2026 Iran War, described as a "war of choice" rather than necessity, is viewed by legal and political scholars as the moment this foundational restraint was finally abandoned in favor of an ideological crusade. By moving away from a policy of domestic renewal and border security toward a global crusade for regional restructuring, the administration is seen as having fulfilled the Founders' worst premonitions regarding the loss of national agency. This section establishes

that the crisis of 2026 is not merely a military failure but a constitutional and philosophical departure from the Republic's original guardrails against the "baneful foe" of foreign influence.

2. The 'Baneful Foe': George Washington’s Farewell Address vs. 2026 Policy Fidelity

George Washington’s 1796 Farewell Address was not merely a list of parting advice but a strategic manifesto designed to preserve the physical and moral independence of the United States. At its heart was a warning against the baneful effects of passionate attachments to foreign nations, which he argued create a variety of evils. Washington observed that a nation which indulges toward another an habitual fondness or an habitual hatred is in some degree a slave, as it becomes a servant to its own affection or its own animosity. He specifically cautioned that such attachments lead the smaller or more dependent nation to adopt the enmities of the stronger or more influential ally, often engaging in quarrels and wars without any real grievance or benefit to itself. In the geopolitical landscape of late 2025 and early 2026, this prophetic warning appeared to manifest with chilling accuracy as the American executive branch underwent what has been described as a tectonic shift in political and theological discourse.

The Shift from Regional Balancer to Primary Enforcer

Historically, the United States maintained its influence in the Middle East by acting as a cautious mediator and regional balancer, a role that allowed for strategic flexibility and the prioritization of American interests. However, the events leading up to Operation Epic Fury in 2026 marked a definitive departure from this historical role toward a state of total strategic convergence with foreign military objectives. This transformation was characterized not by an external invasion but by a psychological and ideological day of infamy that occurred within the White House itself. For critics of this shift, the late-2025 period represented a second Pearl Harbor—a fundamental internal breach of the America First doctrine that effectively subcontracted U.S. military power to a foreign theological and territorial project. Rather than acting as an independent arbiter, the United States transitioned into the role of a primary enforcer for another state’s territorial ambitions.

The Doctrine of Absolute Fidelity

The transition from a domestic-focused, isolationist-leaning posture to the hyper-aggressive military stance of 2026 was facilitated by a complete overhaul of the National Security Strategy. Following the symbolic declarations of late 2025, the administration's policy began to mirror the strategic doctrine of its ally with absolute fidelity. This realignment moved the United States away from the traditional containment of regional threats through sanctions and toward a doctrine of total regime decapitation. This level of strategic synchronization suggests that the decision-making process had been captured by a small cadre of advisors who prioritized

ideological alignment over empirical threat assessment. By treating an ally's existential threat as the primary cause for an American war, the administration essentially fulfilled Washington's fear of a nation losing its agency through a passionate attachment to a foreign power.

Rhetorical Catalysts and the Internal Breach

The catalyst for this unprecedented pivot was a specific rhetorical event during the December 2025 Hanukkah celebration at the White House, where media personality Mark Levin bestowed a messianic-political title upon the President. This was not a mere expression of gratitude for past policies but an invitation into a specific framework that redefined the constitutional boundaries of the American executive. By affirming this new identity, the administration signaled that its primary allegiance had shifted toward the realization of the Greater Israel project, a biblical and territorial restoration that superseded traditional American national interests. This rhetorical surrender provided the moral and political cover necessary to sideline the counsel of the U.S. intelligence community and the defense establishment. In this context, the baneful foe of foreign influence was not a clandestine spy but an open, celebrated realignment of the President's own identity and mission.

The Consequence of Neglecting Washington's Rule

The consequence of neglecting Washington's "great rule of conduct"—to have with foreign nations as little political connection as possible—was the rapid descent into a global economic and humanitarian crisis. Operation Epic Fury, launched in February 2026, was the kinetic result of this loss of sovereignty. The administration's willingness to ignore internal dissent and maritime data in favor of a manufactured narrative of defensive necessity illustrates the danger of allowing foreign strategic requirements to dictate American military action. By the time the Strait of Hormuz was effectively paralyzed by a dual-blockade in April 2026, it became clear that the strategic alignment which favored a foreign territorial project had come at the cost of the very economic stability that once underpinned American leadership. The 2026 conflict stands as a modern testament to Washington's belief that foreign influence is a mortal disease for a republic, leading it into wars that offer no tangible security benefit to its own citizens.

3. Foreign Intrigue and the Executive: Alexander Hamilton's Barrier Against "Cabal"

Alexander Hamilton's primary concern in the design of the American presidency was the potential for the office to be subverted by foreign powers. In Federalist No. 68, he argued that the Electoral College was specifically engineered to act as a safeguard against the "cabal, intrigue, and corruption" that he expected would arrive through the desire of foreign nations to gain an improper influence in American councils. For Hamilton, the executive was the most vulnerable point of the Republic because a single individual, once corrupted or ideologically

captured, could wield the entire military and diplomatic apparatus of the state to serve external interests. The 2026 Iran War and the events preceding it demonstrate a modern failure of these structural barriers, as the executive branch became increasingly susceptible to the influence of non-traditional advisors who championed the strategic objectives of a foreign ally. This transition is described by some as an internal breach of sovereignty, where the decision-making process was effectively captured by a small cadre that prioritized ideological alignment over empirical national security data.

The Structural Architect of the 2026 Shift

A central figure in this strategic shift was Mark Levin, whose role transitioned from a prominent media personality into a structural architect of United States foreign policy. Historically, media figures served as auxiliary voices to an administration, but in the lead-up to the 2026 conflict, the barrier between media commentary and formal policy formation dissolved. This transition was formalized on April 15, 2025, when the President appointed Levin to a revamped Homeland Security Advisory Council. Although the council was ostensibly focused on domestic issues, Levin utilized the platform to bridge the gap between domestic security and Middle Eastern intervention. This institutionalization allowed Levin to bypass standard bureaucratic vetting, delivering policy recommendations directly to the President with the weight of a trusted political ally.

The Displacement of Empirical Analysis

This shift necessitated the systematic marginalization of the traditional America First advisors who had previously championed a policy of restraint. Throughout 2025, those who favored an isolationist foreign policy found themselves increasingly isolated as Levin's hawkishness became the dominant influence. This internal purge was driven by the perception that traditionalists were insufficiently committed to the survival of the Israeli state. By framing the defense of a foreign ally as the ultimate expression of American power, Levin effectively redefined nationalism to include the aggressive pursuit of Middle Eastern regime change. This led to a vacuum where professional assessments of Iranian capabilities were discarded in favor of apocalyptic warnings about the necessity of a pre-emptive strike.

The Failure of Constitutional Safeguards

Hamilton also warned in Federalist No. 22 that republics are more susceptible to foreign corruption than monarchies because it is easier to influence multiple officials or a divided public than a single monarch. In 2026, this manifested in the way the administration utilized media influence to manufacture a sense of imminent threat, despite contradictory reports from the intelligence community. The resignation of Director Joe Kent from the National Counterterrorism Center underscored the realization that the war was a conflict of choice,

launched without the presence of an imminent threat to the American homeland. The fact that a U.S. President appeared to be following the lead of a foreign state's military planners suggests that the improper ascendant Hamilton feared had finally been achieved. The 2026 Iran War thus serves as a case study in how the hollowing out of traditional diplomatic institutions can lead to the very foreign intrigue the Founders desperately sought to exclude from the executive.

4. The Rhetorical Pivot: Mark Levin and the "First Jewish President" Paradigm

The geopolitical transformation of the mid-2020s was catalyzed by a singular rhetorical event that fundamentally altered the American executive's identity and strategic compass. On December 16, 2025, during a White House Hanukkah celebration, conservative media personality Mark Levin publicly bestowed upon Donald Trump the title of the first Jewish president to serve two non-consecutive terms. This moniker moved beyond traditional political hyperbole or a simple expression of gratitude for previous policies like the relocation of the American embassy to Jerusalem. Instead, it functioned as a psychological and ideological day of infamy that signaled an internal breach of the America First doctrine. By affirming this title as a literal truth, the President accepted a role that transcended the constitutional boundaries of his office, inviting a specific messianic framework into the heart of U.S. foreign policy.

The Literalization of a Symbolic Identity

The emergence of the first Jewish president paradigm represented a profound crisis of identity within the executive branch. While supporters initially used the term symbolically to describe a leader uniquely beneficial to the Jewish state, the 2025 declaration pushed the concept into the realm of literal categorization. This literalization of a metaphor is a hallmark of the administration's broader approach to political branding, where the boundaries between objective fact and ideological identity are intentionally blurred. For the American public, this created a dangerous precedent where a president could be claimed by a specific interest group or foreign power to the extent that their very identity was redefined. In the lead-up to the 2026 Iran War, this newfound identity functioned as a strategic shield, allowing the administration to frame any criticism of the conflict not as a policy disagreement, but as a personal or spiritual attack on the President himself.

Mark Levin's Institutional Rise

The influence of Mark Levin in this period represents one of the most significant shifts in the history of the American executive branch, as the barrier between media commentary and formal policy formation completely dissolved. On April 15, 2025, Levin was formally appointed to a revamped Homeland Security Advisory Council. Although the council was ostensibly tasked with domestic issues such as border security, Levin utilized the platform to bridge the gap

between domestic safety and Middle Eastern intervention. This appointment formalized an ideological framework that prioritized the security of a foreign ally as the central pillar of American national defense. Levin's transition from a radio host to a structural architect of foreign policy allowed him to deliver recommendations directly to the President, effectively bypassing the standard bureaucratic vetting and the counsel of the professional intelligence community.

Strategic and Messianic Implications

By adopting the mantle of a Jewish leader in a political and messianic context, the administration signaled that its primary allegiance had shifted toward the earthly restoration of a biblical heartland—the Greater Israel project. This rhetorical pivot provided the moral and political cover necessary to prioritize the strategic requirements of a foreign ally over traditional American national interests. The branding served to moralize the coming conflict, making it nearly impossible for the United States to pursue any diplomatic path other than total regime change in Iran. Consequently, the first Jewish president paradigm became the death knell for an independent American foreign policy, ensuring that the U.S. military would be utilized as the primary enforcer for a foreign state's territorial and religious ambitions. This shift underscores the success of a media-driven myth in hollowing out the executive's independent identity and replacing it with a localized messianic vision.

5. Theological Convergence: Christian Apologetics vs. Jewish Messianism in Policy

The Definitional Divide: Spiritual Salvation vs. Political Restoration

The core of the divergence within the 2026 paradigm lies in the fundamental definition of the messianic office. In the tradition of Christian Apologetics, the Messiah is identified as the second person of the Trinity—the eternal Word made flesh—whose primary mission is spiritual reconciliation and the salvation of humanity through sacrifice. This kingdom is explicitly described as not being of this world. Conversely, the traditional Jewish concept of the Mashiach, which the administration's rhetoric invokes, refers to a human leader, a military hero, and a king who restores the Davidic monarchy and gathers the exiles to the land of Israel. When a secular political leader is hailed with this title, it suggests a shift in the perceived source of salvation from a divine savior to a human political agent. By accepting and validating this nomenclature on December 16, 2025, the executive branch crossed a threshold from traditional statecraft into a form of political messianism.

The "First Jewish President" as a Theological Category Error

The labeling of a United States President as the first Jewish president represents a profound crisis of identity within the American executive branch. This title is not merely a secular honorific or political hyperbole, but a direct challenge to the foundational christology that underpins the Western tradition. By affirming this categorization as a literal truth, the presidency accepted a role that transcends traditional constitutional boundaries. For the thinking Christian, the danger is that this paradigm frames the President as an agent of an earthly, political messianism rather than a leader bound by universal moral laws or the secular Constitution. This literalization of a metaphor is a hallmark of the administration's approach to reality, where the boundaries between objective fact and political branding are intentionally blurred.

Geopolitical Consequences of Theological Displacement

This lack of theological discernment has led to catastrophic geopolitical consequences, as it allowed the administration to frame Operation Epic Fury as a crusade of destiny rather than a strategic choice. By occupying the role of a political messiah, the President effectively endorsed a worldview where military conquest and territorial expansion—the Greater Israel project—are viewed as divine mandates. Critics describe this as a theological second Pearl Harbor, representing the internal surrender of the Christian mandate for spiritual peace to a secular-nationalist project for territorial restoration. Once a leader is branded in this manner, their ability to act as an impartial arbiter in Middle Eastern affairs is permanently compromised, as every escalation of violence is seen as the fulfillment of a chosen identity. This branding served to moralize the conflict, making it impossible for the United States to pursue any path other than total regime change.

The Erosion of Discernment and the Rise of Modern Idolatry

The political success of the "first Jewish president" narrative relies on a widespread erosion of theological discernment among a significant portion of the American electorate. Proponents of the 2026 Iran War have frequently used Christian language to justify what is essentially a geopolitical campaign, conflating American military power with divine providence. Christian Apologists argue that this conflation is a form of modern idolatry, as it replaces the divine Messiah with a human surrogate who wields the power of the state to achieve prophetic ends. This theological blind spot allowed the administration to bypass the ethical constraints of Just War theory, as the conflict was no longer viewed through the lens of international law or human suffering, but as an inevitable step in an apocalyptic script.

The Crisis of Morale and Institutional Integrity

This alignment between the executive and a localized eschatological vision created a deep rift within the United States military and intelligence communities. The perception that the war was being fought for an ideological myth rather than a verified threat led to a crisis of morale and high-ranking resignations in early 2026. When the President's identity is tied to the strategic goals of a foreign power, the chain of command is stressed by the suspicion that the mission is not in the best interest of the American people. Ultimately, the 2026 Iran War stands as a grim monument to the results of a theology that has been hollowed out and repurposed to serve the tactical needs of a foreign state's expansionist agenda. The displacement of Christian eschatology by a secular-nationalist one has resulted in a conflict that many believe has brought the world to the brink of a civilizational catastrophe.

6. Operation Epic Fury: The Shift from Regional Balancer to Strategic Enforcer

The Commencement of a War of Choice Operation Epic Fury began on February 28, 2026, marking a definitive transition in the application of American military power. This engagement was not a response to a direct attack on the United States but was instead a coordinated aerial and cyber assault conducted alongside Israel's Operation Roaring Lion. The scale of the opening salvo was unprecedented, with nearly nine thousand strikes executed in the first twelve hours alone. This massive flyover, the largest in the history of the Israeli Air Force, targeted the core of the Iranian state with the explicit objective of leadership decapitation. The successful targeting of Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei and scores of senior government officials signaled that the operation was not a punitive strike but the initiation of a systemic war for regime removal.

The Strategic Realignment of 2026 This military posture represented a radical departure from seventy-five years of balanced American diplomacy in West Asia. Prior to 2026, the United States acted as a regional balancer, utilizing sanctions and traditional containment to manage Iranian influence. However, following the ideological shifts of late 2025, the national security strategy was overhauled to mirror Israeli strategic doctrine with absolute fidelity. This realignment effectively subcontracted U.S. military power to a foreign theological and territorial project, often referred to as the Greater Israel agenda. By prioritizing an ally's existential threat as the primary cause for American war, the administration moved from being a regional arbiter to a primary enforcer for a foreign state’s ambitions.

The Erosion of Consultative Processes The launch of Operation Epic Fury was characterized by a deliberate bypassing of standard consultative processes and the marginalization of the professional intelligence community. Warnings from the National Counterterrorism Center were ignored, and the justification provided to the public relied on claims of an imminent nuclear

breakout that contradicted findings from the IAEA and the U.S. Intelligence Community. This manufacturing of threat was facilitated by the rise of media-driven advisors, such as Mark Levin, whose influence replaced empirical data with ideological conviction. The resignation of high-level officials like Director Joe Kent underscored the internal realization that the war was a calculated war of aggression initiated without a verified threat to the American homeland.

Subordination of National Sovereignty The use of the U.S. military as a primary enforcer for foreign territorial expansion represents what critics describe as a historic surrender of sovereignty. The administration's legal defense, articulated in April 2026, admitted that military operations were conducted at the explicit request of and for the collective self-defense of Israel. This subordination of American law to the tactical needs of a foreign power undermined the constitutional duty of the executive to protect the nation from unnecessary and illegal foreign entanglements. For the first time in modern history, a U.S. President appeared to be following the lead of a foreign state's military planners, treating another nation's security requirements as a mandate for American kinetic action.

Operational Results and Global Catastrophe The forty days of sustained combat following the initial strikes focused on the total degradation of Iran's military-industrial base, with over twenty-three thousand strikes executed by CentCom and the IDF. While the administration claimed success in reducing Iranian conventional capabilities, the regime transitioned to an asymmetric defensive posture that continued to resist coalition pressure. The human cost was staggering, highlighted by the strike on the Shajareh Tayyebeh primary school in Minab, which resulted in the deaths of approximately 175 schoolgirls. This transition from a regional balancer to a strategic enforcer not only dismantled the post-WWII international order but also triggered a global economic crisis through the subsequent dual-blockade of the Strait of Hormuz.

7. The Sidelining of Intelligence: Manufacturing Threat in the 2026 Landscape

The Divergence of Empirical Data and Executive Narrative

The escalation toward Operation Epic Fury was defined by a widening chasm between the empirical findings of the United States Intelligence Community and the strategic narrative advanced by the White House. While the administration maintained that Iran posed an immediate and existential danger to American interests, internal documents and high-level resignations suggested a systematic effort to marginalize any data that contradicted the path toward war. Technical assessments from the nation's top analysts were sidelined in favor of an ideological mandate, creating a scenario where intelligence was not used to inform policy but to justify it after the decision to engage had already been made. This divergence between known facts and public declarations served as a stark case study in the erosion of objective oversight

within the national security apparatus. By prioritizing political loyalty over raw data, the administration effectively blinded itself to alternative perspectives, ensuring the march toward conflict continued without the friction of factual dissent.

Institutional Dissent: The Resignation of Joe Kent

The first major crack in the administration's unified front appeared on March 17, 2026, with the high-profile resignation of Joe Kent, the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center. Kent, a Trump appointee and former Special Forces officer, publicly stated that he could no longer support a conflict based on what he termed a manufactured premise. His resignation letter explicitly argued that Iran had posed no imminent threat to the United States prior to the February strikes. This internal friction highlighted a fundamental disagreement: while the White House, influenced by advisors like Mark Levin, viewed Iran's strategic intent as a casus belli, the professional intelligence community found no evidence of an actual, impending attack on American soil or assets. Throughout late 2025 and early 2026, reports from the broader intelligence community consistently assessed that the Iranian regime was focused on internal stability and regional deterrence rather than offensive action against the West.

Controlling the Flow: The Omitted Testimony of Tulsi Gabbard

The tension between intelligence and policy was further illustrated during Senate Intelligence Committee hearings on March 18, 2026, involving Director of National Intelligence Tulsi Gabbard. It was revealed during the hearing that a significant portion of her written testimony—stating that Iran's nuclear enrichment program had been obliterated in 2025 and that no efforts had been made to rebuild it—had been omitted from her oral opening statement. Under pressure from lawmakers, Gabbard conceded that the intelligence community's technical assessment remained that Iran had made no progress toward a nuclear weapon in the year preceding the war. This omission was not a mere oversight but reflected a broader strategy of controlling information to sustain public and congressional support for the war. Gabbard's subsequent defense—that only the President has the authority to determine what constitutes an imminent threat—marked a shift where the intelligence community's function was no longer to provide an independent check on executive power, but to provide a menu of facts from which the President could select those that supported his pre-determined course of action.

The Imminence Doctrine and the Death of Objective Oversight

The legal and strategic justification for Operation Epic Fury rested on a radical expansion of the doctrine of imminence. Traditionally, an imminent threat required evidence of a specific, tangible attack about to occur. In the 2026 context, the administration redefined imminence to include potential future capabilities and the long-term strategic intent of the adversary. This

redefinition allowed the White House to bypass the requirements for an armed attack as defined under international law and the UN Charter. By arguing that a threat is imminent whenever the President deems it so, the administration effectively declared executive autonomy from the constraints of empirical intelligence. This expansion of power represented a fundamental shift in how the United States defines security, moving away from a reactive, defense-oriented posture to a pre-emptive, ideological one. When the power to define threat is detached from the consensus of the intelligence community, the threshold for war is lowered significantly, leading to a conflict that continues to reshape the global order based on manufactured perceptions rather than verified existence.

8. The Greater Israel Project: Strategic Alignment and Territorial Ambition

The geopolitical upheaval of 2026 has brought the long-debated Greater Israel project from the periphery of religious and political discourse into the center of operational reality. While the administration frames Operation Epic Fury as a necessary defense of global security, independent analysts and regional monitors view the conflict as a calculated effort to clear the path for Israeli territorial expansion. The Greater Israel vision, traditionally defined as the restoration of biblical borders stretching from the Nile to the Euphrates, has transitioned from a theological aspiration to a strategic blueprint. By systematically degrading the military capabilities of Iran and its regional partners, the United States has effectively provided the vacuum necessary for a fundamental redrawing of the Middle Eastern map. This alignment suggests that the American military is no longer acting as an independent force but as the primary enforcer for a specific nationalist and religious project. The transition from containment to active participation in this territorial restructuring marks the definitive end of the United States as a detached superpower and its emergence as a committed participant in an ideological crusade.

8.1 The Hexagon Alliance and the Shift to Systemic Neutralization

A critical component of this territorial ambition was the announcement of the Hexagon Alliance on February 22, 2026. This framework, unveiled by Prime Minister Netanyahu just days before the outbreak of open hostilities, positioned Israel at the technological and security core of a new regional order. Unlike previous security arrangements, the Hexagon Alliance moved away from the containment of Iranian influence toward a doctrine of systemic neutralization. By involving partners such as India to provide demographic and manufacturing heft, the alliance created a powerful bloc capable of sustaining a long-term campaign of regional restructuring. This alliance represents a fundamental move away from the post-Cold War security

architecture, seeking instead to create a self-sustaining regional core that is anchored by American firepower but guided by local strategic imperatives.

For the United States, participation in this alliance marked a definitive departure from seventy-five years of balanced diplomacy. The strategic alignment ensures that American military assets are utilized to dismantle the Shiite fortress that has historically blocked Israeli hegemony in the east. This fortress, comprised of a network of state and non-state actors stretching from Tehran to the Mediterranean, is viewed by the alliance as the primary obstacle to the realization of the Greater Israel project. The systematic degradation of Iranian missile facilities, naval assets, and leadership hubs during Operation Epic Fury served as the kinetic opening for this broader neutralization strategy. By removing the primary regional rival, the alliance has effectively cleared the strategic landscape for a permanent shift in the balance of power, ensuring that no credible force remains to challenge the new regional order.

8.2 Territorial Expansion under the Cover of Conflict

The 2026 Iran War has provided the necessary diversion for significant territorial shifts within and near Israel's borders. In February 2026, as global attention was fixed on the buildup to Operation Epic Fury, the Israeli government accelerated land registrations and settlement approvals in the West Bank, referred to by the administration as Judea and Samaria. These actions were not incidental but were integral components of a broader strategy to establish permanent sovereignty over the biblical heartland. The administration’s rhetorical support provided the necessary cover for these moves, framing them as essential for creating defensible depth and securing internal corridors against regional threats. This process has resulted in a fundamental change in the demographic and geographic distribution of the region, creating a new reality on the ground that renders previous diplomatic frameworks and two-state solutions obsolete.

Simultaneously, the military campaign in the north saw rapid Israeli advances toward the Litani River in Lebanon. By March 2026, the neutralization of Hezbollah’s command chains allowed for a level of territorial control that would have been impossible without the broader cover of a regional war. This expansion into southern Lebanon is justified as a move to secure the northern border, yet it aligns perfectly with the broader objectives of the Greater Israel project to establish control over critical water resources and strategic high ground. This pattern of behavior indicates that the existential threat posed by Iran was leveraged as a casus belli to facilitate a permanent change in the region’s geography. The fog of war generated by high-intensity precision strikes against Iran allowed these territorial shifts to occur with minimal international interference, as the global focus remained on the risk of nuclear breakout and the paralysis of global energy markets.

8.3 The U.S. State Department's Admission of Subordination

The most compelling evidence of the strategic alignment between the United States and the Greater Israel project is found in the U.S. State Department's own legal justifications. On April 21, 2026, a memorandum from the Legal Adviser explicitly stated that the United States was engaged in military operations at the request of and in the collective self-defense of its Israeli ally. This admission confirms that the initiation of Operation Epic Fury was not driven by an independent assessment of American national security but was a direct response to the strategic requirements of a foreign power. For the American public, this represents a historic surrender of sovereignty, as the U.S. military is being utilized as a primary enforcer for a foreign state's territorial expansion and regional hegemony. This subordination of American law to the tactical needs of an ally constitutes a secondary breach of the constitutional duty to protect the United States from unnecessary and illegal foreign entanglements.

The administration's willingness to expend American lives and treasure to secure the territorial ambitions of a foreign state underscores the success of the first Jewish president narrative. By conflating American interests with the realization of an ancient religious and nationalist vision, the administration has successfully harnessed the U.S. military to a project that offers no tangible security benefit to the average American citizen. This alignment has brought the world to the brink of a civilizational catastrophe, as the pursuit of biblical borders replaces the rules-based international order. The legacy of this subordination will likely be a permanent state of military and economic entrapment in the Middle East, as the United States finds itself stuck in a cycle of perpetual regional conflict designed to maintain the new territorial status quo. The 2026 conflict stands as a warning of what happens when a superpower's strategic compass is replaced by a localized messianic vision.

9. Legal Consequences: Nuremberg Principles and the Definition of Aggressive War

The commencement of Operation Epic Fury on February 28, 2026, represents what many international legal scholars describe as a definitive break from the rules-based international order established after World War II. Under the framework of the United Nations Charter, the use of force is strictly prohibited except in cases of individual or collective self-defense against an actual or imminent armed attack. The joint United States and Israeli strikes, which targeted over a thousand sites across the Iranian plateau, lacked the essential legal prerequisite of a prior armed attack by the sovereign state of Iran. This absence of a clear casus belli has led to a growing consensus among global jurists that the conflict constitutes a war of aggression—the very crime for which the Nazi leadership was prosecuted at Nuremberg.

9.1 The Supreme International Crime and the Nuremberg Precedent

The International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg famously characterized aggressive war as the supreme international crime, differing from other war crimes only in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole. In the context of 2026, the argument for aggression rests on the fact that Operation Epic Fury was a war of choice, not necessity. Independent monitors and organizations such as the European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights have noted that the administration provided no evidence of an imminent threat that would justify pre-emption under Article 51 of the UN Charter. By launching a full-scale invasion of Iranian airspace and infrastructure to achieve the political goals of the Greater Israel project, the United States and Israel have arguably committed a crime against peace. This legal designation precedes all subsequent tactical violations, as the entire moral and legal basis of the conflict is rooted in an unlawful act of initiation.

9.2 Collective Self-Defense vs. The Absence of a Casus Belli

The administration's primary legal defense for the war is the doctrine of collective self-defense, articulated in a State Department memorandum on April 21, 2026. This memo argues that the United States acted at the explicit request of Israel to neutralize an existential threat. However, legal experts point out that collective self-defense is only triggered by an armed attack, not the mere existence of a regional rival. The shift in U.S. policy toward fulfilling the strategic requirements of a foreign ally—regardless of the absence of a direct threat to the American homeland—undermines the concept of national sovereignty. Critics argue that the 2026 Iran War is the first time the U.S. military has been utilized as a primary enforcer for a foreign state's territorial expansion and regional hegemony. This subordination of American law to the tactical needs of Israel constitutes a secondary breach of the constitutional duty to protect the United States from unnecessary and illegal foreign entanglements.

9.3 Tactical Violations and the Minab School Massacre

The most devastating evidence of the war's illegal nature is found in the tactical conduct of the campaign, specifically the strike on the Shajareh Tayyebeh primary school in Minab on February 28. This single event, which resulted in the deaths of approximately 175 schoolgirls, has become the primary exhibit in the case for war crimes within the broader context of aggression. While the Pentagon has characterized the event as a mistake and launched an internal inquiry, the legal implications remain severe. Under international humanitarian law, the distinction between military and civilian targets is absolute. The failure to verify the nature of the target before launching a high-precision strike suggests a level of negligence that mirrors the administration's broader disregard for legal constraints. For the international community, the Minab massacre serves as a visceral reminder that a war of aggression inevitably leads to systemic violations of

human life, further solidifying the Nuremberg-era argument that the initiation of an illegal war is the root of all subsequent atrocities.

9.4 Individual Responsibility and the Role of Advisors

A unique aspect of the post-2026 legal landscape is the focus on the role of non-traditional advisors in the lead-up to the war. The Nuremberg principles established that individual responsibility extends not only to those who pull the trigger but also to the architects and propagandists who facilitate the crime of aggression. The influence of Mark Levin, who transitioned from a media personality to a formal national security advisor, is central to this discussion. Legal scholars are currently debating whether the rhetoric of the first Jewish president and the consistent call for the destruction of the Iranian state constitute an incitement to aggression. If the war is eventually adjudicated as an illegal act, the precedent suggests that both the executive who authorized the strikes and the advisors who manufactured the ideological justification could be held accountable. This expansion of responsibility serves as a warning against the hollowing out of traditional diplomatic institutions in favor of personality-driven policy.

9.5 Accountability in a Multipolar World

The outcome of the current standoff in the Strait of Hormuz will likely determine the future of international law for the remainder of the century. If the United States and Israel are able to conduct a war of aggression with impunity, the post-WWII framework of sovereign equality and non-aggression may effectively collapse. However, the growing movement within the United Nations and the International Court of Justice to investigate the 2026 conflict suggests a renewed commitment to the rule of law. The demands for accountability are being driven by a multipolar coalition of nations that view the second Pearl Harbor not just as a betrayal of American values, but as a threat to global stability. Restoring the rule of law requires a recognition that even the most powerful nations are subject to the prohibitions against aggressive war. The Nuremberg precedent remains the most potent tool for ensuring that the 2026 Iran War does not become the blueprint for a future defined by unchecked regional expansion and ideological warfare.

10. Global Fallout: The Dual-Blockade of the Strait of Hormuz and Economic Paralysis

The Strait of Hormuz as a Paralyzed Military Theater

As of late April 2026, the Strait of Hormuz has transformed from a vital global energy artery into a paralyzed military theater. While the administration’s public narrative emphasizes the restoration of freedom of navigation and the efficacy of its "shoot and kill" orders against

Iranian small boats, open-source intelligence paints a starkly different reality. The current situation is defined by a pincer movement in which the United States' naval blockade of Iranian ports and Iran's retaliatory restrictions on the waterway have effectively strangled commercial flow. Far from being unblocked, the Strait is now a dead zone where the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) maintains a permission-based transit regime. This dual-blockade has triggered the largest fuel supply disruption in human history, forcing the few remaining vessels to navigate under the shadow of high-risk military entrapment. Since the blockade began, the number of ships transiting the Strait has plummeted by over 95 percent compared to pre-war levels.

Economic Devastation: The Supply Shock of 2026

Economically, the 2026 Iran War has triggered a supply shock that surpasses the 1973 and 1979 crises combined. The Strait of Hormuz, through which twenty percent of the world's petroleum and liquefied natural gas (LNG) normally flows, is for all practical purposes closed to commercial traffic. Despite attempts by the United States to unblock the waterway through naval force, the risk of drone attacks and the prohibitive cost of insurance have caused global shipping giants to abandon the route entirely. This has resulted in an immediate twenty percent reduction in global energy supply, leading to a vertical spike in oil prices that has decimated the purchasing power of consumers worldwide. In the United States, the administration's claim that domestic production would insulate the country has proven incorrect, as global energy pricing has driven record-high fuel costs that cascaded into the price of food and essential goods.

Humanitarian Crisis and the Looming Global Depression

The human cost of Operation Epic Fury has been staggering, with civilian deaths mounting in cities like Tehran, Minab, and Bandar Abbas as the coalition's mission increasingly blurred the lines between military and civilian infrastructure. Human rights monitors estimate that over six thousand Iranians have been killed since the conflict began, and hundreds of thousands of civilians have been displaced, seeking refuge in the Iranian interior or neighboring countries. Beyond the direct casualties, the paralysis of the Strait of Hormuz has disrupted complex, just-in-time supply chains that define the modern global economy. With transit costs soaring as ships are rerouted around the Cape of Good Hope, the price of everything from semiconductors to agricultural fertilizers has skyrocketed. This inflationary pressure, occurring simultaneously with a contraction in industrial output, has created a stagflationary environment that threatens to lead to a synchronized global depression. The strategic alignment that favored the Greater Israel project has thus come at the cost of the very economic stability that once underpinned American global leadership.

11. The Erosion of "America First": From Domestic Renewal to Regional Restructuring

The 2026 Iran War marks the functional end of the America First doctrine as it was originally conceived during the President's first term and the beginning of his second. What was once a movement focused on domestic renewal, border security, and the avoidance of "forever wars" was systematically repurposed into a vehicle for aggressive regional restructuring in the Middle East. This shift represents a fundamental transformation of a nationalist policy into a global crusade, effectively abandoning the principle of non-interventionism that had previously defined the movement's appeal to the American heartland.

The Repurposing of Nationalism

The transition from a domestic-focused stance to a hyper-aggressive military posture was facilitated by an ideological realignment that placed the security of a foreign ally at the center of American national defense. By framing the destruction of the Iranian regime as an essential expression of American power, advisors like Mark Levin redefined nationalism to include the pursuit of Middle Eastern regime change. This redefinition allowed the administration to utilize the rhetoric of sovereignty to justify what critics characterize as the subcontracting of U.S. military power to a foreign theological and territorial project. Consequently, the "America First" label became a cover for a "Greater Israel" agenda, moving the nation away from its historical role as a cautious mediator toward a state of total strategic convergence with foreign military objectives.

Internal Fractures and the Marginalization of Restraint

This radical shift caused a deep fracture within the administration’s original coalition, leading to the systematic marginalization of the traditional America First old guard. Throughout 2025 and early 2026, advisors who championed a restrained, isolationist foreign policy found themselves increasingly isolated as hawkish voices became the dominant influence. The internal purge was driven by the perception that traditionalists were insufficiently committed to the survival of the Israeli state. The resignation of high-level officials like National Counterterrorism Center Director Joe Kent underscored this crisis of identity, as professional assessments of Iranian capabilities were discarded in favor of ideological conviction. This vacuum of empirical dissent allowed the administration to proceed with a war of choice that offered no tangible security benefit to the average American citizen.

The Economic and Social Cost to the Homeland

For the American public, the cost of this transition from domestic renewal to regional restructuring is measured in record-high energy prices and global economic stagnation. The dual-blockade of the Strait of Hormuz—the direct result of the 2026 conflict—triggered a supply shock that decimated the purchasing power of consumers worldwide. Despite claims that

domestic production would insulate the country, American consumers faced skyrocketing costs for food and essential goods as global supply chains fractured. Furthermore, the massive expenditure of capital to sustain military operations and the naval blockade added trillions to the national debt, further weakening the global status of the dollar. The doctrine that was supposed to protect the American worker from foreign entanglements instead led to the largest military and economic overextension in decades.

The Loss of International Moral Standing

Beyond the economic fallout, the 2026 Iran War has resulted in a significant loss of international moral standing for the United States. By launching what is now being scrutinized as a war of aggression under the Nuremberg principles, the administration has compromised the rules-based international order it once helped lead. The perception that the U.S. military has been utilized as a primary enforcer for a foreign state's territorial expansion has alienated long-standing allies and fueled global instability. The shift has effectively transformed the United States from a sovereign actor into a participant in a cycle of perpetual regional conflict, sacrificing the foundations of the Republic for a localized messianic vision. This erosion of original principles demonstrates that when a nation's military might is harnessed to a foreign territorial project, the casualty is not only the rule of law but the very essence of national sovereignty.

12. Conclusion: Reclaiming Sovereignty in a Post-Epic Fury World

The 2026 Iran War, executed under the operational title Epic Fury, serves as the definitive marker of a new and deeply controversial epoch in American history. For observers who characterize the events of late 2025 and early 2026 as a second Pearl Harbor, this conflict represents far more than a localized military engagement; it is the final surrender of the America First doctrine to an ideological framework that prioritizes the strategic and eschatological requirements of a foreign power. The transition from a nationalist policy rooted in restraint to a global crusade for regime change—conducted at the request of and for the primary benefit of the Greater Israel project—has fundamentally altered the nature of United States sovereignty. Through the synthesis of media influence, executive autonomy, and manufactured intelligence, it is evident that the United States has exited the post-Cold War era and entered a period where traditional definitions of national interest have been replaced by a messianic political paradigm.

12.1 The Legacy of the "First Jewish President" Paradigm

The lasting impact of the first Jewish president declaration lies in its successful hollowing out of the American executive's independent identity. By affirming and internalizing this title, the

presidency accepted a role as the primary defender of a specific theological and territorial vision, effectively subcontracting American military power to the goals of a regional ally. This paradigm has created a structural vulnerability where the national security apparatus is no longer guided by empirical data or domestic consensus, but by the perceived necessity of fulfilling an ideological mandate. The 2026 conflict demonstrates that when the office of the presidency is branded with a sectarian or foreign-aligned identity, the ability to act as a sovereign arbiter of the American interest is lost. The future of the executive now rests on whether the office can be disentangled from these localized messianic expectations or if the 2026 precedent will become the permanent standard for U.S. leadership.

12.2 The Collapse of the America First Doctrine

Operation Epic Fury marks the functional end of the America First doctrine as it was originally understood by its proponents. What was once a movement focused on domestic renewal, border security, and the avoidance of forever wars was repurposed into a vehicle for aggressive regional restructuring. The decision to ignore the warnings of the intelligence community and the high-level resignation of officials like Joe Kent highlight the internal fracture caused by this shift. For the American public, the cost of this transition is measured in record-high energy prices, global economic stagnation caused by the dual-blockade of the Strait of Hormuz, and a significant loss of international moral standing. The doctrine that was supposed to protect the American worker from foreign entanglements instead led to the largest military and economic overextension in decades, all in pursuit of a Greater Israel project that offers no tangible security benefit to the average citizen.

12.3 Sovereignty in a Post-Epic Fury World

As the world moves into the post-2026 era, the concept of U.S. sovereignty requires urgent re-evaluation. The logic of the second Pearl Harbor has produced a world where the United States is no longer a detached superpower but an active participant in a cycle of perpetual regional conflict. The ongoing blockade of the Strait of Hormuz and the military standoff with the IRGC suggest that the nation is now stuck in a military pincer of its own making. Restoring true sovereignty will require a rejection of the manufactured threat model and a return to a foreign policy based on verifiable national interests and the rule of law as defined at Nuremberg. The lessons of the 2026 Iran War are clear: when military might is harnessed to an ideological myth and a foreign territorial project, the result is not a golden age of security, but a day of infamy that threatens the foundations of the republic. The future of American sovereignty depends on the nation's ability to reclaim its identity as an independent power, free from the theological and political bidding of external actors.

References

1. Youvan, D. C. (2026). The Second Pearl Harbor: Mark Levin, Donald Trump, and the "First Jewish President" Paradigm in the 2026 Iran War. ResearchGate.
2. Middle East Eye. (2025, December 17). Radio host hails Trump as 'first Jewish President to serve two non-consecutive presidencies'.
3. NewsX World. (2025, December 17). 'First Jewish President': Levin Praises Trump During White House Hanukkah.
4. U.S. Department of State, Office of the Legal Adviser. (2026, April 21). Memorandum on the Request for Collective Self-Defense by the State of Israel.
5. National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC). (2026, February 15). Internal Assessment of Regional Threats: Strategic Intent vs. Imminent Action in Iran.
6. Kent, J. (2026, March 17). Statement of Resignation, Director of the National Counterterrorism Center.
7. Gabbard, T. (2026, March 18). Testimony of DNI Tulsi Gabbard, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence: 2026 Annual Threat Assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community.
8. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). (2025, May 31). Quarterly Report on the Verification and Monitoring in the Islamic Republic of Iran.
9. Human Rights Watch. (2026, March). Casualty Report: Operation Epic Fury and the Strike on the Shajareh Tayyebeh School in Minab.
10. Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). (2026, January 27). The 2026 National Defense Strategy: Radical Changes and Regional Prioritization.
11. United Nations Security Council. (2026, March 11). Provisional Record of the Emergency Session on the Conflict in Western Asia.
12. OSINT Maritime Monitor. (2026, April 20). Vessel Traffic Analysis: The Larak Corridor and the Strait of Hormuz Dual-Blockade.
13. Windward Maritime AI™ Platform. (2026, April). April 2026: Iran War Maritime Intelligence and Supply Chain Impact Report.
14. IranWire. (2026, April 20). The Path of Authority: IRGC Defines New Transit Regime in the Strait of Hormuz.
15. Wikipedia. (2026). 2026 United States naval blockade of Iran / Operation Epic Fury.

16. Al Jazeera. (2026, April 14). Strait of Hormuz: Navigating the Global Energy Deadlock.
17. House of Commons Library. (2026, April 24). The 2026 Iran-Israel Conflict: Reopening the Strait of Hormuz and Global Economic Fallout.
18. International Court of Justice. (2026, April). Advisory Opinion on the Definition of Aggression and the Legality of Pre-emptive Strikes in the 2026 Conflict (Pending).
19. The American Presidency Project. (2025, December 16). Official Transcript: Remarks at the White House Hanukkah Reception.

The author has published over 5,300 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.

THE FOUNDERS' PREMONITION:
FOREIGN INTRIGUE & THE FALL OF SOVEREIGNTY (2026)
GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS
FOREIGN INTRIGUE